



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/970,066	11/13/97	DHAL	P C-8232

020349  
POLAROID CORPORATION  
PATENT DEPARTMENT  
784 MEMORIAL DRIVE  
CAMBRIDGE MA 02139

IM51/0329

EXAMINER

ANGEBRANDT, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1752

DATE MAILED:

03/29/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or  
proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Advisory Action

Application No.

08/970,066

Applicant(s)

Dhal et al.

Examiner

Martin J. Angebrannt

Group Art Unit

1752



## THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ expires four months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☐ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on \_\_\_\_\_ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Mar 19, 1999 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

### ☒ The proposed amendment(s):

- ☒ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
- ☐ will not be entered because:
- ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
  - ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
  - ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
  - ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
- ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
No data is present evidencing the improved shrinkage properties (table 4 is based on calculations, not measurements) and the comparasions and improvements are presented relative to the duPont materials based upon the disclosure on \*
- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
- Claims allowed: none
- Claims objected to: none
- Claims rejected: 1-14

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

- ☒ Other \* pages 2,4 and 21. The benefit of decreased shrinkage is already known from Dhal et al. WO 97/13183 and there is ample reason to use polyfunctional monomers based upon the increased rigidity and stability relative to enviromental factors. The points argued by the applicant assume that the monomers (polyfunctional and difunctional) are the same size, which is not true.

MARTIN J. ANGEBRANNDT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1752

Art Unit: 1752

\* Evidence showing that the shrinkage is reduced significantly relative to the Dhal et al. WO 97/13183 media would be sufficient to obviate the rejection of record, which directs one of ordinary skill in the art to the polyfunctional monomers of Ohe et al. merely to increase the robustness of the resulting hologram as taught by Keys et al. and Ohe et al. while relying upon the evidence that shrinkage is reduced by using cationically polymerizable monomers, relative to similar free radically polymerizable systems as evidenced by Dhal et al. WO 97/13183. The shrinkage would be related to the proportion of the length/width of the molecule that the linkage represents and based upon this the longer difunctional monomers would be expected to exhibit less shrinkage along their major axis.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Martin Angebrannt whose telephone number is (703) 308-4397.

I am normally available between 7:30 AM and 5:00 PM, Monday through Thursday and 7:30 AM and 4:00 PM on alternate Fridays.

If repeated attempts to reach me are unsuccessful, my supervisor may be reached at (703) 308-2303.

Facsimile correspondence should be directed to (703) 305-3599.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



Martin J. Angebrannt  
Primary Examiner, Group 1750  
March 29, 1999